

Portland State University PDXScholar

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

Oregon Sustainable Community Digital Library

5-9-1996

Meeting Notes 1996-05-09

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact

Recommended Citation

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, "Meeting Notes 1996-05-09 " (1996). *Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation*. Paper 210.

http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact/210

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

**METRO**

Meeting: **JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION**

Date: MAY 9, 1996

Day: THURSDAY

Time: 7:15 a.m.

Place: METRO, CONFERENCE ROOM 370A-B

- *1. MEETING REPORT OF APRIL 11, 1996 - APPROVAL REQUESTED.
- *2. SOUTH/NORTH LRT - COST RESPONSIBILITY ASSUMPTIONS FOR BIKE/PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Leon Skiles.
- *3. RESOLUTION NO. 96-2333 - ENDORSING THE CONGESTION PRICING TASK FORCE - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Andy Cotugno/Bridget Wieghart.
- *4. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN CHAPTER I POLICY COMPONENT OVERVIEW - INFORMATIONAL - Andy Cotugno/Tom Kloster.
(Note: A joint JPACT/MPAC worksession is proposed for May 29 at 5:00 p.m. followed by adoption of Chapter 1 of the RTP update at the regular June 13 JPACT meeting.)

*Material enclosed.

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: April 11, 1996

GROUP/SUBJECT: Joint Meeting of Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC)

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Co-Chairs Charlie Hales and Rod Monroe, City of Portland and Metro Council, respectively; Ed Lindquist, Heather Chrisman and Judy Hammerstad, Clackamas County; Roy Rogers and Linda Peters, Washington County; Earl Blumenauer and Gretchen Kafoury, City of Portland; John Magnano, Clark County; Rob Drake, City of Beaverton; Phil Bogue, Tri-Met Board; Royce Pollard, City of Vancouver; Gerry Smith, WSDOT; Peggy Lynch, Mitchell Wall, and Jim Zehren, Citizen members on MPAC; Jeannine Murrell, Cities of Washington County; Susan McLain, Metro Council; John Kowalczyk, DEQ; Tom Walsh, Tri-Met; Dave Lohman, Port of Portland; Gussie McRobert, City of Gresham; Bruce Warner, ODOT; Bud Farm, Special Districts, Multnomah County; Chuck Peterson, Special Districts, Clackamas County; Jean Schreiber, Cities of Clackamas County; Tanya Collier, Multnomah County; Claudiette LaVert, Cities of Multnomah County; Jill Thorn, City of West Linn; and Lou Ogden, City of Tualatin

Guests: Brian Campbell, Port of Portland; Kathy Busse and Susan Lee, Multnomah County; Elsa Coleman, Steve Dotterrer, Bob Clay, Kate Deane and Meeky Blizzard, City of Portland; Susan Turner, DEQ; Dave Williams, ODOT; Brent Curtis, Andy Back and John Rosenberger, Washington County; Rod Sandoz, Clackamas County; Jay Mower, Hillsdale Vision Group; Rex Burkholder, Bicycle Transportation Alliance; Anne Weaver, Sensible Transportation Options for People; Mary Kyle McCurdy, 1000 Friends of Oregon; Doug Bollam and Ken Sandblast, Citizens; Ron Bergman, Clark County Public Works; Les White, C-TRAN; Mary Legry, WSDOT; G.B. Arrington, Tri-Met; Andy Back, DEQ; Andy Priebe, Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District; Dean Lookingbill, Southwest Washington RTP; Gary Katsion, Kittelson and Associates, Inc.; Kimi Iboshi, McKeever/Morris; Richard Ross and Mike Mabrey, City of Gresham; Jim Crumley, City of Happy Valley; and Tom Coffee, City of Lake Oswego

PERSONS ATTENDING: Staff: Mike Burton, Executive Officer; Andy
(Continued) Cotugno, John Fregonese, Gina Whitehill-
 Baziuk, Larry Shaw, Heather Nelson, David
 Ausherman, Mike Hoglund, John Cullerton, Tom
 Kloster, Mark Turpel, Brenda Bernard, Tim
 Raphael, Carol Kelsey, Michael Morrissey, and
 Lois Kaplan, Recording Secretary

MEDIA: Gordon Oliver, The Oregonian

SUMMARY:

The JPACT membership was called to order and a quorum declared by Co-chair Rod Monroe.

MEETING REPORT

Commissioner Rogers moved, seconded by Commissioner Collier, to approve the March 14, 1996 JPACT meeting report as submitted. The motion PASSED unanimously.

The MPAC membership was called to order and a quorum declared by Co-chair Charlie Hales. He noted that no MPAC meeting minutes were under consideration.

PLAUDIT

Committee members gave a round of applause for Commissioner Blumenauer on his recent victory toward filling the Congressional seat vacated by newly elected Senator Wyden.

RAIL-VOLUTION CONFERENCE

Commissioner Blumenauer announced that the second Rail-Volution Conference would be held in Washington, D.C. next September 8-10, encouraging participation by the jurisdictions. He cited conference partners that included Bi-State Development, St. Louis, Missouri; Capital Metro, Austin, Texas; City of Portland, Portland, Oregon; Regional Transit District, Denver, Colorado; the Surface Transportation Policy Project; Tri-Met and Metro, Portland, Oregon; the Oregon Department of Transportation; the Utah Authority; and the Federal Transit Administration.

Jurisdictions were encouraged to submit nominations to Commissioner Blumenauer for panel members or proposals to spotlight Portland at the conference. This year, the conference will

showcase communities from around the country in their efforts to utilize rail as a means of improving mobility, stimulating the local economy, and revitalizing neighborhoods. He asked that every jurisdiction do their part in promoting the Rail-Volution conference. A flyer on the proposed conference, including an appropriate nomination form, was distributed.

RESOLUTION NO. 96-2316 - ESTABLISHING A POSITION ON A THIRD COLUMBIA RIVER HIGHWAY BRIDGE

Co-chair Monroe highlighted the Staff Report/Resolution that would establish the region's position on a third Columbia River Highway bridge. He explained that the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC) had formed a Transportation Futures Committee to look at various options to meet Clark County's transportation and growth needs. One of the options they have decided to study is a third bridge either on the west side or the east side of the region.

Councilor Monroe clarified that the intent of this resolution is not to tell Clark County what to do but to let them know what the Oregon side of the region's position is relative to building a third auto bridge.

Action Taken: Commissioner Blumenauer moved, seconded by Commissioner Hales, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 96-2316, establishing a position on a third Columbia River Highway bridge.

In discussion on the motion, Dave Lohman pointed out that the resolution is specific in referring to a bridge on the Westside and the Eastside. He commented on congestion in the I-5N corridor and efforts made with the Port of Vancouver. He indicated it was a major route for trucks in the region and that, within the I-5 corridor, all viable options for movement of trucks and people need to remain on the table. He didn't want this resolution to preclude further considerations in their dealings with the Port of Vancouver, and was supportive because it didn't.

A discussion followed relating to origins of freight in the area. Dave Lohman commented that the Port was looking at freight movement within the region and between ports. He noted that it represents a significant problem. The question was raised as to whether it constituted an interstate problem but that data was not available to Mr. Lohman.

Commissioner Magnano spoke in support of South/North light rail, indicating that he would abstain from the vote. He felt it would be beneficial if JPACT representatives would present their position at a Transportation Futures Committee meeting so that realistic options would be put before the public. He noted that

a committee of 18 citizens are looking at a wide variety of transportation improvements. Co-chair Monroe stated that Oregon is in a position to consider options in the I-5 corridor and acknowledges that the bridge is old. The resolution is crafted to state the region's position on the Westside freeway that was proposed to connect to the Western Bypass and the Eastside route near Troutdale.

Commissioner Hales complimented Metro in clarifying the region's position in the resolution. Mayor Pollard of Vancouver agreed with Commissioner Magnano's comments but indicated he would support the resolution. Gerry Smith of WSDOT indicated he would also abstain but was supportive in having JPACT clarify its position before the Transportation Futures Committee.

Commissioner Blumenauer asked whether it would be appropriate to have a small diversified group go before the Clark County Transportation Futures Committee to discuss the region's land use/transportation policies and issues. Commissioner Magnano indicated it would be appreciated and would help to get them along a more constructive path in furthering their land use and comprehensive plans. Councilor Monroe indicated he would be happy to work with Clark County but felt he would await an invite from the jurisdiction in that regard.

Co-chair Monroe then opened the meeting for public testimony.

Anne Weaver, Outreach Coordinator for Sensible Transportation Options for People (STOP), testified in support of the resolution. Her organization has endorsed regional goals, policies and funding mechanisms that lead people away from sprawling auto use. She noted that the Clark County Transportation Futures Committee's study is inconsistent with those goals.

In calling for the question, the motion PASSED. Commissioner Magnano and Gerry Smith abstained.

REGIONAL FRAMEWORK PLAN PHASE I

John Fregonese, Metro Growth Management Services Director, explained that the regional parking policy, defined under Title 2 of the draft *Regional Framework Plan*, has evolved over a three-year period starting at DEQ. It has been discussed at Metro since September 1995 and translated into a regional policy. He described the purpose as follows: to attempt to affect travel behavior, reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and increase transit use; develop a more compact urban form with limited parking; comply with TPR requirements for Metro to adopt a 10 percent reduction in parking/capita; and to serve as an air quality measure.

Charts were displayed depicting comparisons between Clackamas Town Center and Lloyd Center developments. Clackamas Town Center (CTC) totals 1.2 million square feet situated on 100 acres while Lloyd Center comprises 1.5 million square feet on a 30-acre site. Differences between the two developments relate to factors such as parking management and the availability of transit service. Mike Burton indicated that owners of the CTC have plans to more densely develop their site.

Questions were raised during discussion whether employment figures, number of people that visit the centers, and sales per square foot were available for the two centers. John Fregonese indicated that the information would be gathered. Co-chair Hales noted that Pioneer Place is recognized as having the highest number of sales per square foot on the West Coast.

In describing the parking proposal, John indicated there were three provisions: 1) there is a regional minimum parking standard (equal to DEQ's maximum standard); 2) there are two parking maximums established (identified as Zones A and B); and 3) there are parking maximums for all 2040 mixed-use design types which are 125 percent of the minimums within the gray area (depicted on map) and 150 percent of minimums outside that area. John elaborated on the effect of the ratios, noting that industrial uses have no maximums.

Also noted was the exemptions process that can be demonstrated by no foreseeable 20-minute transit service, insufficient pedestrian activity generated by adjacent neighborhoods, and no significant pedestrian activity within the present business district.

A discussion followed on the two administrative procedures whereby local governments can seek a variance or propose that some of the areas be changed from Zone A to Zone B, the higher parking minimum. John explained that landscaping is over and above the parking ratio.

Mayor McRobert noted clarification to be made in the "Intent" section. She distributed copies of the proposed amendment to committee members, indicating the correction should begin on Line 155 following the word "objectives" and read as follows:

Notably, it relies upon reducing vehicle trips and related parking spaces through minimum and maximum parking ratios. This title is provided...

There was Committee consensus for incorporation of the proposed amendment.

Andy Cotugno, Metro Transportation Director, elaborated on Title 6 of the draft *Regional Framework Plan* relating to regional

accessibility. This section dealt with boulevard design, street connectivity and local service. He explained that Metro proposes to begin implementing some of the 2040 design concepts in advance of full *Regional Transportation Plan* (RTP) and *Regional Framework Plan* adoption. He noted that these are the aspects of transportation planning that we need to implement at this time.

Boulevard design concepts involve the major streets serving higher density development (mixed-use development) as designated on the Boulevard Design Map conducive to a pedestrian-friendly environment. It is recommended that comprehensive plans call out these design concepts and incorporate some of the features that create a more mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly environment.

Andy referred the joint committee to Mike Burton's April 4 memo regarding recommended changes to Title 6. The proposed language change was recommended to require incorporation of boulevard design treatment in all 2040 mixed-use land use types.

Action Taken: Commissioner Hales moved, seconded by Commissioner Blumenauer, to amend Lines 371 through 374 of the draft *Regional Framework Plan* to read as follows:

In general, pedestrian and transit-oriented design elements are the priority in the central city, and regional centers, ~~while pedestrian and transit features are more balanced with motor vehicle design needs in station communities, main streets and town centers:~~

In discussion on the motion, committee members cited several areas in Washington County that are dependent on motor vehicle transportation in view of the fact that transit is not provided. Also discussed was the fact that the concepts do more with getting people back on their feet rather than on a bus. Peggy Lynch commented that Forest Grove is the most pedestrian-friendly city in this region but encouraged further discussion with Tri-Met on the need for transit service.

Commissioner Peters felt that the design specifics would also attract employers and hoped that the activity would follow.

Councilor McLain felt that committee members should be more insightful and set priorities for the future rather than dwell on the past. She felt the language in question would help achieve the regional goals.

Commissioner Lindquist felt the region should be thinking in terms of the future but needs to recognize that we are also talking about full transit service in the Portland metro area, and that goal needs to be reached. He commented that there are areas in Clackamas County that don't have transit service.

Mayor McRobert spoke of developments such as Fairview (Fairview Village) and Troutdale as examples of successful development where transit is not provided.

Mayor Ogden spoke of the City of Tualatin's concern that these requirements would become general application. He felt the requirements are appropriate and should be applied, but cited the lack of connectivity with all other streets that fit into that designated area. He felt that requirements are being placed that don't function. He also cited the need to face the economic realities when the focus is on quality of life and transit service. With limited funding, Tri-Met is not going to be able to provide that needed service.

Mayor Drake suggested adding a clause that states "until transit service is available or setting certain level of service or frequency of service." His concern also dealt with main streets and felt the issue should be addressed.

The issues of using design standards in places that don't have transit and the use of valid street designs being dependent on transit were further discussed. It was also felt that there should be further discussion on the definition of what is a boulevard design.

Andy Cotugno explained that the full RTP update creates a hierarchy of streets and there would be different expectations for different parts of the transportation system. He asked that boulevard design elements be incorporated into these streets when a project is developed. It would provide a requirement that these boulevard design elements be considered. The 2040 map designating corridors, town centers, main streets and transit availability will be incorporated. Jim Zehren questioned what would happen if, after local consideration, the jurisdiction chose not to implement the design standards. Once again, it was noted that the intent is to allow the region to have the kinds of standards to make it more accessible for pedestrian/bike activities.

In calling for the question, the motion PASSED unanimously.

A discussion on street connectivity followed. As more of the region develops, areas with five acres or more will start to develop street connectivity. Jurisdictions are asked to amend their comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances for compliance with either a design option or a performance option in the development review process. The design option is intended to identify the kinds of features that would accomplish street connectivity. The performance option has two criteria: 1) to minimize local traffic on the regional motor vehicle system so that the local circulation pattern does not exceed the 1995

regional trip median by more than 25 percent; and 2) that local traffic needs are served by direct, connected local street systems with the shortest motor vehicle trip over public streets from a local origin to a collector or greater facility to be no more than twice the straight-line distance and that the shortest pedestrian trip on public right-of-way is no more than one and one-half the straight-line distance.

Concerns were expressed about meeting the performance standard. Mike Burton responded that this represents a commitment that the jurisdictions would try to achieve these standards. He noted, however, that this does not represent a final vote on the draft *Regional Framework Plan* which is a working document. On April 24, the draft will be submitted for public comment. Mike felt the jurisdictions have decided to go the performance route and sensed a good, strong jurisdictional commitment to try to achieve these standards. He referred the jurisdictions to the mandate in Section 5 of the Metro Charter that requires adoption of a *Regional Framework Plan* by December 31, 1997. Mike Burton pointed out that, if the jurisdictions don't want to deal with this, it will be left up to the developers. He clarified that it is the cities' and counties' responsibility to carry on planning, not the developers.

Jim Zehren was supportive of the jurisdictions dealing with the issues. He felt the communities will figure out what it should look like. He cited the need for neighborhood planning until development fills in and communities to work together for people.

Mayor McRobert emphasized the importance of educating our citizenry and the need for appropriate signing where future streets will be located. Member comments were supportive of the cities and counties developing their own local street design maps.

Co-chair Hales felt that the jurisdictions need to decide which of these issues are imperative to include in Phase I as interim measures as opposed to inclusion in the final *Regional Framework Plan*. He felt the connectivity policy should be encouraged in development, was hesitant about requiring a major planning effort, and felt we should be cautious in requiring an extensive effort in Phase I.

Mayor Drake indicated he was generally supportive of connectivity measures and the need to find creative ways to achieve those measures. He noted that people support the concept until you open up their neighborhood to another roadway. He cited safety issues and the fact that we should be mindful that not everyone will embrace this concept, but he would support it.

Andy Cotugno reported on the exception component relating to environmental and topographical elements.

John Fregonese noted that a draft connectivity map will be prepared at the request of each jurisdiction.

Other comments concerned the need for Metro's issues to be defined clearly, to allow for an exchange of ideas, and to allow the local jurisdictions some flexibility in the use of these standards. The *Regional Framework Plan* represents a concept to be adopted by the region in striving for livable communities.

Mayor Ogden expressed concern about the amount of work being placed on the jurisdictions. Co-chair Monroe stated that it is critical that the cities and counties focus on this effort in a cooperative manner. Councilor McLain reminded the jurisdictions of the flexibility the plan entails and that its benefits would ultimately result in cost savings.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded that Lines 427 through 432 of the draft *Regional Framework Plan* read as follows:

Cities and counties shall ensure that their comprehensive plans, implementing ordinances and administrative codes require demonstration of compliance with performance criteria. ~~Approval of new developments~~ Cities and counties shall include develop a local street designs map with street intersection spacing to occur at intervals of no less than 8 per mile...

The motion PASSED unanimously.

Dave Lohman of the Port of Portland requested that the language on Lines 420 and 429 of the draft *Regional Framework Plan* be amended to insert the words residential and mixed-use prior to the word "development." The committee concurred with the proposed change.

Andy Cotugno explained that the current RTP requires level-of-service D as the region's standard for the peak hour which is higher than what the public expects. The issue at hand is that the Framework Plan will call for changes in the land use designations. In order to adopt that requirement, Metro has to show that transportation is adequate to accommodate the travel for that land use change. There is a pretty significant impediment to accomplish these land use changes.

The suggestion at hand is to incorporate revisions into the *Regional Framework Plan* to get public comment to see whether this constitutes the right standard. Andy spoke of the different alternatives for 2040, the TPR requirements and reviewed the Region 2040 selected performance measure chart. He cited the importance of the RTP update and the need to address the congestion issue.

Brent Curtis, Planning Manager at Washington County, emphasized the immediacy of the problem and Washington County's concern in looking at early alternatives in managing 2040 growth by addressing land use/transportation issues. He noted that the region is growing substantially. Brent reported problems in station community planning, citing examples such as 185th to Hillsboro and the Peterkort properties. In looking at overall traffic demand, Washington County found that, under current level-of-service standards, they can't balance land use standards for development built on light rail with current transportation standards. The Westside station community area planning chart was displayed to help illustrate the problems encountered. He spoke of the problem of changing land use to meet the objectives and the inability to meet the TPR requirement while applying the existing regional standard. He cited the need to modify the performance measures to allow them to meet the 2040 land use goals.

To resolve the problem, meetings have been convened by Washington County with participants that include the regional land use/transportation jurisdictions, consultants, developers, ODOT, and Tri-Met, who concluded that the level-of-service standard wasn't realistic. They concur in the need to measure level of service by an accessibility standard. The working group has decided to continue working together to more fully balance the land use/transportation needs. Brent acknowledged that developing standards is a complex issue requiring all energies and cited the need for the final solution to be identified in the RTP update.

Andy Cotugno noted that, to ensure that the *Regional Framework Plan* goes out for review, there will be a more in-depth discussion on the level-of-service issues. In Mike Burton's memo dated April 4, 1996, he proposes three recommendations: 1) evaluate where there is a congestion problem by paying attention to how well the system works beyond the peak hour; 2) after finding there is a congestion problem, determine what aspect of accessibility it hinders; and 3) then decide what to do about it by examining a series of alternatives that limits that accessibility situation.

A question was raised about the requirement under Congestion Management that action shall be applied for grid and/or parallel facilities if local trips on the congested regional facility exceed 25 percent of the regional median for facilities of the same motor vehicle classification. Andy Cotugno explained that this is the same standard recognized in the Street Connectivity section.

Bruce Warner was supportive of the proposed addition to Section 4 of the *Regional Framework Plan* but cited the need to temper the LOS standards. His concern was that the general public has no

idea of what the level of service means. He emphasized the importance of clearly and graphically describing what we mean by level-of-service standards so the public can make honest choices. He asked that these discussions be held with a broad base of stakeholders. In response, Mike Burton reported that a series of workshops had been scheduled on the *Regional Framework Plan*, noting that the transportation component of the land use policy is the least understood.

Dave Lohman cited the need for flexibility and options in the standards regardless of which standard is applied. Andy noted that the standards as currently written apply to regional facilities and are not applicable to collectors or local roads. These standards would apply for the full 20-year land use/transportation plan.

It was suggested that the language or alternatives follow the words "the following actions" under the Congestion Management clause and that clause 3 of that section be corrected to state TDM solutions rather than "TM" as noted on page 4 of Mike Burton's April 4 memo.

Mayor Ogden of Tualatin felt that the transportation system in the region does not work and that the land use exacerbates that problem. In dealing with the public, discussion centers on performance measures that increase congestion rather than reduce it. He felt it constitutes a real concern and cited the need for congestion results that are no worse than they are today. Peggy Lynch challenged that position, stating that congestion in the Portland region is far less severe than elsewhere and it was important to develop a transportation system compatible with the 2040 Growth Concept.

Action Taken: Peggy Lynch moved, seconded by Councilor McLain, to recommend incorporation of a new Section 4 (as defined in Mike Burton's April 4, 1996 memo) in the draft *Regional Framework Plan* with correction in subsection 3 to read TDM instead of "TM."

The motion PASSED unanimously.

Action Taken: Commissioner Hammerstad moved, seconded by Commissioner Lindquist, to recommend approval of moving forward with Title 2 (Regional Parking Policy) and Title 6 (Regional Accessibility) of the draft *Regional Framework Plan* for a public hearing process.

The motion PASSED unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

John Kowalczyk extended praise to everyone involved in development of the interim parking measures. He noted that DEQ is

counting on the 2040 Growth Concept to meet air quality compliance for its Ozone/CO Maintenance Plans.

Mike Burton announced that copies of the public comment document evolving from the open houses on livability were available at the meeting. Chuck Peterson, representing Special Districts of Clackamas County, complimented Metro on its presentation at one of the livability open houses.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Mike Burton
JPACT Members



METRO

draft

March 26, 1996

To: South/North Steering Group

From: Leon Skiles
South/North Project Manager

Re: Cost Responsibility Assumptions for Bike/Pedestrian Facilities

The purpose of this memorandum is to propose a standard for cost responsibility assumptions for bike/pedestrian facilities within the South/North Project. These assumptions would be reflected in the conceptual engineering plan and profiles that will be the basis of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) results and cost analysis. The proposal is as follows:

- The project would pay for and construct bike/pedestrian facilities needed to directly access station areas. The precise definition of those facilities would be determined through the DEIS/FEIS/Preliminary Engineering (PE) process and through negotiations with the Federal Transit Administration, finalized through the execution of the full funding grant agreement.
- Streets that would be reconstructed due to the construction of light rail (e.g. Interstate Avenue, Railroad Avenue) would include bike lanes and sidewalks requested by the local jurisdiction and which are in conformity with the local jurisdiction's adopted street design standards and bike/pedestrian plans, constructed and paid for by the South/North Project. The precise definition of those facilities would be determined through the DEIS/FEIS/PE process and through negotiations with the Federal Transit Administration, finalized through the execution of the full funding grant agreement.
- Conceptual and preliminary designs for the major river crossings would include a bike/pedestrian path or paths on the light rail structure. However, sources other than the South/North Project would be responsible for financing the marginal increase in cost (operating and maintenance and capital) of the structure due to the addition of the bike/pedestrian facility. We would need to work with Tri-Met to determine an accurate and equitable method of determining the marginal cost increase. There may be an economy of

scale through a combined facility and the resulting savings would be passed on to the bike and pedestrian facility.

Following is a proposed list of South/North structures that would include a bike/pedestrian path to be financed by others:

1. Ross Island LRT Crossing
2. Caruthers Crossing
3. Columbia Slough Crossing (just north of Kenton)
4. North Portland Harbor Crossing (on the south end of Hayden Island)
5. Columbia River Crossing

The final design (and construction) of any of these bike/pedestrian pathways would be dependent upon the ability of the region to 1) determine the benefits of the potential pathways in relationship to their costs; 2) select the pathway as a priority for funding; and 3) secure funds to pay for them prior to construction. South/North would continue to prepare our environmental analysis based upon the bike/pedestrian pathways until it is determined that funding for all or some of the facilities cannot or should not be secured.

- Other sections of the LRT alignment may offer opportunities to accommodate bike/pedestrian pathways to be built and financed by others. Identification of those opportunities would come in response to public and agency comments received during the DEIS process. However, unilateral design modifications by the South/North Project would only be made if the design modifications would not result in significant cost increases to the Project. Significant increases in the marginal cost of an LRT facility that would accommodate other bike/pedestrian paths would need to be covered by other funding sources and those design modifications would only be made after it was determined to be a local or regional priority and that funding sources outside of the South/North Project would be secured to cover the cost increases. These types of changes would be identified within the *Locally Preferred Strategy Report* which will be adopted following publication of the DEIS and the DEIS public hearing. Those design changes would then be incorporated into the Project's Preliminary Engineering drawings, the Final EIS and the Project's funding plan.

This proposal has received support from the South/North Project Management Group and was reviewed by the South/North Citizens Advisory Committee.

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 96-2333 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORISING THE CONGESTION PRICING TASK FORCE

Date: April 25, 1996

Presented by: Michael Hoglund

PROPOSED ACTION

The adoption of this resolution endorses the composition and mission of the Congestion Pricing Task Force which will oversee the two-year study on Congestion Pricing being undertaken jointly by Metro and ODOT.

TPAC has reviewed the composition of the Congestion Pricing Task Force and recommends approval of Resolution No. 96-2333.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

In 1991, as part of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, Congress approved the funding of a series of demonstration projects and related studies to promote the implementation of congestion pricing. Metro and ODOT submitted a joint application and, in 1995, received approval to undertake a \$1.2 million pre-project study of congestion pricing in the region. The study will assess public attitudes about the concept; develop and evaluate a number of congestion pricing alternatives; and make a recommendation as to whether an appropriate demonstration project can be established in the Portland metropolitan area.

Congestion pricing is a transportation management tool which applies market pricing principles to roadway use. It is a fairly new and controversial concept in the transportation field but has been used successfully for years by the utility industry to better manage peak period usage. It involves the application of user surcharges or tolls on congested facilities during peak traffic periods. It is the only fee system that is aimed specifically at managing peak period travel demand.

Interest in this concept has been growing within the region due to projected growth and the resultant increases in congestion that are anticipated over the next 10 years. Current analyses indicate that it is beyond the region's financial capability to build sufficient highway capacity to accommodate the demand of all those who wish to drive during peak commute periods. Congestion pricing may provide a method to reallocate scarce resources so the need for expensive road construction is reduced.

Metro has issued RFPs for the technical and public involvement work programs and has selected teams for both elements. The technical team will be headed up by ECO Northwest and includes Mark Bradley, Deakins/Harvey/Skabardonis, Parsons Brinkerhoff,

Rao Associates, Kittelson and Associates, PSU Center for Urban Studies and Pacific Rim Resources. The public involvement team will be led by Cogan Owens Cogan with support from Davis and Hibbitts, Pacific Rim Resources, Cole and Weber and an expert panel including technical advisors.

Contract negotiations with both consultant teams are underway and work should begin in about a month. A Technical Advisory Committee comprised of interested agencies will be formed to provide critical agency perspectives and technical expertise.

Due to the relative newness of the concept and the potential for significant public concern, Metro and ODOT have agreed to establish a study advisory task force of business and community leaders. The task force will be responsible for making a recommendation to JPACT, the Metro Council, and the Oregon Transportation Commission as to whether an appropriate congestion pricing demonstration pilot can be developed and tested within the Portland metropolitan area.

The task force will provide a broad-based, long-range perspective into the issues associated with a possible congestion pricing project in this region. The task force will provide oversight to the technical work and public outreach efforts associated with the study and will ensure that the topic is comprehensively addressed. Task force members will also serve as spokespersons within their various fields and communities.

It is anticipated that the task force will meet once every one or two months throughout the two-year study.

The specific charge of the task force and a list of individuals proposed for membership are defined on Exhibits A and B of the attached resolution.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING THE) RESOLUTION NO. 96-2333
CONGESTION PRICING TASK FORCE)

Introduced by
Councilor Rod Monroe, Chair
JPACT

WHEREAS, Section 1012(b) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 authorized the Secretary of Transportation to create a Congestion Pricing Pilot Program to fund a series of demonstration projects and related studies to promote the implementation of congestion pricing; and

WHEREAS, Metro and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) submitted a joint application to undertake a study to assess public attitudes about the concept; develop and evaluate a number of congestion pricing alternatives; and make a recommendation as to whether an appropriate demonstration project can be established in the Portland metropolitan area; and

WHEREAS, Resolution No. 93-1743A endorsed the region's application for a congestion pricing pilot project and directed Metro and ODOT staff to pursue ISTEA funds for this purpose; and

WHEREAS, Metro and ODOT have received approval and \$1.2 million in funding to undertake a Congestion Pricing Pre-project Study (the study); and

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 96-628 amended the FY 1995-96 budget and appropriations schedule for the purpose of conducting the study; and

WHEREAS, Due to the relative newness of the concept and the potential for significant public concern, Metro and ODOT have

agreed to establish a task force of business and community leaders to provide advice and direction on the study. The role and responsibilities of the task force are more fully described on Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, Metro and ODOT have agreed that the task force should be comprised of a working group of broad-based, multi-disciplinary and geographically-diverse individuals. The list of 14 individuals who are recommended for membership are listed on Exhibit B; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED:

That the Metro Council finds that a Congestion Pricing Task Force should be established with the role and responsibilities described on Exhibit A and the membership as detailed on Exhibit B for the purpose of providing oversight and direction to the Congestion Pricing Pre-pilot Study and making a recommendation to the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), the Metro Council, and the Oregon Transportation Commission as to whether a demonstration project of congestion pricing should be undertaken in the Portland metropolitan area and, if so, what its parameters should be.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of May 1996.

Jon Kvistad, Presiding Officer

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel

Exhibit A

Role and Responsibilities of the Congestion Pricing Task Force (the Task Force)

Role of the Task Force

The task force will provide a broad-based, long-range perspective into the issues associated with a possible congestion pricing project in this region. The task force will provide oversight to the technical work and public outreach efforts associated with the study and will ensure that the topic is comprehensively addressed. Task force members will also serve as spokespersons within their various fields and communities and consider interests beyond their membership.

Responsibilities of the Task Force

It is anticipated that the task force will meet approximately once every month throughout the two-year study and will be charged with the following responsibilities:

1. Assess the case for and against congestion pricing and its practical feasibility to reduce peak period congestion, vehicle miles traveled and motor vehicle emissions and to evaluate other potential effects on the community which would help or hinder implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept.
2. Oversee public outreach efforts to increase awareness and understanding of congestion pricing by the general public and affected interest groups.
3. Evaluate the results of the study to determine the technical feasibility and public acceptance of congestion pricing in the Portland region.
4. Develop regional consensus on whether a congestion pricing pilot demonstration project should be undertaken and, if so, what its parameters should be.
5. Provide a final Task Force report and appropriate interim updates to the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), the Metro Council and the Oregon Transportation Commission.

Exhibit B

CONGESTION PRICING TASK FORCE

Government/Ex Officio

Mike Burton
Henry Hewitt

Business/Community Members

Robert Scanlan - President, Scanlan, Kemper, Bard Company.

Matthew Klein - Senior Vice President, Ashforth Pacific, Inc.
Association for Portland Progress.

Delna Jones - Project Director, The Capital Center. Former State
Representative from Washington County.

Jon Egge - Owner MV Plumbing. Extremely active in Clackamas
County.

Thomas Mesher - President, Mesher Supply Co. Member Central
Eastside Industrial Council.

Carl Hosticka - Associate Vice President, Statewide Education
Services

Steve Clark - Publisher, Community Newspapers.

Kenneth Baker - Attorney, State Legislator.

Ethan Seltzer - Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies,
School of Urban and Public Affairs, Portland State University.

Karen A. Baird - Director, Product and Strategy Development, US
West.

Lawrence Dark - President and CEO of the Urban League of
Portland.

Michael Salsgiver - Government Affairs Manager, Intel.

Exhibit B

CONGESTION PRICING TASK FORCE

Business/Community Members

Robert Scanlan - President, Scanlan, Kemper, Bard Company.

Matthew Klein - Senior Vice President, Ashforth Pacific, Inc.,
Association for Portland Progress.

Delna Jones - Project Director, The Capital Center. Former State
Representative from Washington County.

Jon Egge - Owner, MV Plumbing. Extremely active in Clackamas
County.

Thomas Mesher - President, Mesher Supply Co. Member Central
Eastside Industrial Council.

Carl Hosticka - Associate Vice President, Statewide Education
Services, University of Oregon.

Steve Clark - Publisher, Community Newspapers.

Kenneth Baker - Attorney, State Legislator.

Ethan Seltzer - Director, Institute of Portland Metropolitan
Studies, School of Urban and Public Affairs, Portland State
University.

Karen A. Baird - Director, Product and Strategy Development, US
West.

Lawrence Dark - President and CEO of the Urban League of
Portland.

Michael Salsgiver - Government Affairs Manager, Intel.

Government/Ex Officio

Mike Burton - Executive Officer, Metro.

Henry Hewitt - Chair, Oregon Transportation Commission.

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE

JPACT

DATE

5-9-96

NAME

AFFILIATION

✓ ROB DRAKE

CITIES OF WASH. CO.

✓ Roy Rogers

WASHINGTON CTY.

✓ ~~Earl Blumenauer~~

CLACKAMAS CO.

✓ Earl Blumenauer

Portland

✓ Judy Coopers

metro

✓ Rod Monroe

Metro Council

✓ Mike Burton

Metro Exec

✓ DON MORISSETT

METRO

✓ JOHN KOWALCZYK

DEQ

✓ TANYA COLLIER

MULTNOMAH COUNTY

✓ TOM WALSH

TRI-MET

✓ David Lehman

Port of Portland

✓ Claudette LaVest

Cities of Mult. County

✓ Susan McLean

Metro

✓ Kerry Smith

WSDOT

✓ Dean Longbill

RTC

Bridget Wieghart

Metro

ROD SANZOL

CLACKAMAS COUNTY

Pat Collmeyer

NGI

TOM KLOSTER

NETRO

Maggie Collins

Cities of Clackamas Co.

Bruce Holberg

Daily Journal of Commerce

GB ARROWSON

TRI-MET

DATE _____

AFFILIATION

Ted Brown
 Dave Vaden
 Susie Labere
 Jay Mower
 Donna Scott
 Elsa Coleman
 Richard Ross
 Merky Blizzard
 STEVE DOTTERER
 Kathy Lehtola
 Kathy Buss
 Dave Williams
 Phil Brander